DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 828 SP 014 572

AUTHOR Buffie, Edward G.
TITLE Significant Factors in the Employment Process: Views From Administrators and Teachers.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 102p.; For related document, see SP 010 374

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Decision Making; Employment Interviews; *Job Applicants; Job Market; Job Placement; Principals; *Success Factors; *Teacher Employment; Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

Followup studies of a teacher education program emphasizing active field experience in public schools revealed that graduates had a high rate of success in obtaining teaching jobs. This study was designed to find out what factors were involved in the process of hiring these students. A comprehensive forced-choice questionnaire was submitted to principals and others in decision-making positions to discover what were the most important criteria in the final decision to hire an applicant for a teaching position. Results of responses provide a profile of administrative thinking in weighing personal and professional abilities of applicants. Results also give a picture of the attitudes of administrators toward the school the applicant attended and the kind of education programs considered by them to be effective. Questionnaire results are presented in tabular form with narrative exposition. Appended to this report is a Job Search Model that has been used by graduates of the program under examination. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175828

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward G. Buffie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SIGNIFICANT FACTORS IN THE EMPLOYMENT PROCESS

VIEWS FROM ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS

Principal Investigator

Edward G. Buffie

Elementary/Early Childhood Education

School of Education

Indiana University

Bloomington, Indiana

SP 014 512

Project Completed

January 1979

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This investigator is very much indebted to his former students who have contributed so very much through their participation in a number of research studies conducted in recent years. We also appreciate the cooperation of their building principals and/or supervisors.

Special thanks must also go to Dean Richard Turner, former Associate Dean for Research, for his help in developing the instrument and to The Indiana Center for Evaluation. Center personnel set up the computer program and helped with the organization and analysis of the data.

INTRODUCTION

At the time of their matriculation (1972-76), the Block Program was one of five major options available to students preparing to become elementary teachers. Three of these offerings were in fact complete professional programs; that is, all professional components (courses, modules, experiences) were accounted for in the program itself. Presumably each of the elements was well articulated with the others and mutually reinforcing (approximately 45 semester hours). These programs included The Early Childhood Program, The Encore Program, and The Multi-Cultural Program. Block is not a program in this complete sense and should be more appropriately identified as a project since only fifteen (15) hours of professional preparation were included.

The Block Project. Block was a professional semester for students in their second semester of the Junior Year or first semester of the Senior Year. The following characteristics were associated with this option: (1) team approach to instruction; (2) flexibility of program; (3) carefully articulated work with respect to preparation in Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies; (4) carefully articulated collegiate and field experiences in the schools (optional but usually selected by ninety-five percent of the participants); and (5) student representation in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the program itself. As a rule, students were required to sign up for all 15 hours which then ensured maximum flexibility in program planning. It was possible, however, for portions of the program to be waived as is true for those students who took math methods during their Sophomore Year (special project). On occasion, students were

permitted to participate in the program over two semesters or a summer and a semester because of unusual personal circumstances. About eighty-five to ninety percent of the students took the full complement of hours in one semester.

Following the Block Semester, students had several different Student Teaching Options. Such choices were open to students in the Block and the Campus-Based Programs. (See Diagram 1)

The Study in Context. The present study is the fourth of five conducted by this investigator which deal with the Block Program.* Two of these studies dealt with the employment situation and related questions: Do students who complete the Block Program ultimately find teaching positions? If so, what kind of teaching roles do they assume? At what level do they teach? Where do they teach? How do they find jobs? If students are not teaching, what are they now doing?

Another study considered questions related to earlier decision-making and perceptions: How (and when) do students make career choices? How do students view pre-requisite work? How do students make decisions related to a choice of professional program, i.e., the Block Program? Why do students opt for the Block Program? How do students view the future?

In addition, this investigator has also developed a Job Search Model which has been used extensively by Block students during the past several years. Preliminary testing of the model occurred in 1974 and 1975. The present version was completed in 1976 and will be revised in 1979. See Appendix II for further details.

---

*See Appendix I for listing.

DIAGRAM 1

Options For Elementary Majors

Generalist Preparation

Campus-Based — **Block Program** — **Encore**

(Programs of Preparation for the generalist--K-6 teachers/no particular reference to age, grade level, or background of students to be taught)

Specialized Preparation

Early Childhood Education

(Program of Preparation for Teachers of Young Children Ages 3-8)

Multi-Cultural Education

(Program of preparation for Teachers of Children with Multi-cultural Backgrounds)*

Choice of Student Teaching

- Non-Project
- Project
  - American Indian
  - Latino
  - Urban Semester
  - Etc.

Student Teaching Experience

All predetermined as a result of admission to program

*Backgrounds are also characterized by poverty.

Rationale for the Study. From earlier studies, it is evident that Block students have enjoyed phenomenal success in finding teaching positions or work in related fields. Eighty percent found and were offered full-time teaching contracts. An additional ten percent located work in related fields, fields where one's preparation as an elementary major was critical to obtaining a given position.

In another of our earlier studies, some data was generated that provided information regarding why our students had been so successful in obtaining jobs. (With the supply and demand situation which presently exists in the teaching profession, it does appear somewhat unusual that Block students should enjoy such tremendous success in the job search.) The instrument used in this study was unsophisticated and open-ended. There were two dimensions of the study: (1) What factors were most important in the final stages of the selection process--interview invitation and decision to offer contract?; and (2) To what extent are former Block students successful in their first year of teaching? Perceptions of both teachers and administrators were sought in order to determine if there was any relationship between their views.

The current in-depth study was designed to provide additional information about the entire process of selection through the use of a comprehensive forced-choice questionnaire. The data generated could serve as a real base for future programmatic decisions. A knowledge of the criteria used in teacher selection could be taken into account in strengthening our teacher education program as well as in revising our Job Search Model. In so doing, we would further increase the probability of our students finding positions in the job market. Any attempt by the University to increase the marketability

of its graduates is appropriate and desirable. Motivation on the part of students and faculty is certainly affected by success in finding teaching positions.

PART ONE

THE PROBLEM

The problem under investigation had one major focus, we simply wanted to find out as much as possible about the selection process. Most of the questions in this study were directed to this end. In addition, we also wanted reactions to our present program of teacher preparation.

The specific questions used in this study were:

1. What is the background of the school administrators who employ Block students?
2. With respect to teacher education, what perceptions do these administrators have of Indiana University and the School of Education?
3. What factors are significant in the selection process?
4. To what degree are such factors significant?
5. When are they significant in the selection process?
6. Are there differences of perception between teachers and administrators regarding said factors?
7. How might we improve our program of teacher education?

PART TWO

THE PROCEDURES

The development of the design and instrument used in this study was a result of this investigator's participation in a Research Seminar conducted by Professors Richard Turner and Lee Ehman during the Spring Semester of 1976. Dr. William Voorhies, of the I.U. School of Education Placement Bureau, and members of the Block Faculty/Student Committee were also most helpful during consultations regarding early development of the instrument. Final instrumentation was determined with the aid of Dean Turner.

In its final form, the questionnaire had five major components.* Parts I and II were to be filled out by administration. These sections provided information relative to their backgrounds and perceptions. The main body of the questionnaire was to be found in Part III. This section dealt with all aspects of the selection process. Parts IV and V were very brief. Participants were simply asked to: (1) identify the most important factors in the selection process; and (2) make suggestions for improvement of our teacher education program. The last three sections were completed by administrators and teachers.

At the same time, decisions were being finalized regarding instrumentation. Ms. Penny Githens, of The Indiana Center for Evaluation, assisted us in developing an appropriate computer program for analyzing the data. This phase of the investigation was completed in the early fall of 1976.

On October 1, 1976, the questionnaires were sent out to graduates of The Block Program, 1973-75, who had been successful in finding teaching

---

*See Appendix III for Questionnaire.

positions. Follow-up letters were sent out on November 1 and December 1. Questionnaires were also sent to their respective administrators, i.e., principals. Because of changes which had occurred--marriages, change of jobs, retirements, etc.--only one-hundred twenty-five people in each group were located. Responses were received from one hundred principals and ninety-eight teachers. The return thus approximated eighty percent for each group. The findings reported in the next section are based upon this population.

The collection of data, computer analysis, and synthesis of tabular dates were completed by the end of 1977.

PART THREE

THE FINDINGS

Parts I and II of the questionnaire provided information relative to the backgrounds and perceptions of the principals participating in the study. Teachers were not asked to respond to these parts of the questionnaire. Not all principals responded to every item, thus the f will vary.

Part I Educational Background of Principals. Table 1 shows that all of the eighty-five respondents hold Master Degrees. Of this number, twenty-two, or twenty-six percent, hold the Ed.S. degree and twelve, or fourteen percent, possess the doctorate.

Twenty-eight, or thirty-three percent, have their Bachelor's degree from universities outside the state of Indiana; and twenty-two, or twenty-six percent, from schools other than the four state universities. Forty percent of the principals received their first degrees from Indiana University (19), Ball State (8), Indiana State (7), or Purdue (1).

For their Master's degree, 35, or forty-one percent, matriculated at Indiana University; 21, or twenty-five percent, from universities outside of Indiana; thirteen, or fifteen percent, from Ball State University; six, or seven percent, from Indiana State University; and two, or two percent, from Purdue University.

Of the twenty-two Ed.S. holders, eleven, or fifty percent, obtained their degree from Indiana University Bloomington; seven, or thirty-one and eight tenths percent, from universities outside of Indiana; one, or four and five tenths percent, from Indiana State University; one, or four and five tenths percent from Purdue University; one or four and five tenths percent

from Ball State University; and one, or four and five tenths percent, from other Indiana schools.

Seven, or fifty-eight and three tenths percent, of the twelve who have doctorate degrees received them from Indiana University Bloomington; three, or twenty-five percent, from universities outside of Indiana; one, or eight and three tenths percent, from Purdue University; and one, or eight and three tenths percent, from Ball State University.

TABLE 1. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF PRINCIPALS

	Bachelors		Masters		Specialist		Doctorate	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Indiana University	19	22.4	35	41.2	11	50.0	7	58.3
Indiana State University	7	8.2	6	7.1	1	4.5		
Purdue University	1	1.2	2	2.3	1	4.5	1	8.3
Ball State University	8	9.4	13	15.3	1	4.5	1	8.3
Other In-State	22	25.9	8	9.4	1	4.5		
University Outside Indiana	28	32.9	21	24.7	7	31.8	3	25.0
Total	85	100.0	85	100.0	22	100.0	12	100.0

The School System. Table 2. describes the school systems where the principals work. Nineteen, or twenty-one and eight tenths percent, are in a small city over ten thousand in population; nineteen, or twenty-one and eight

tenths percent, in a rural LT of two thousand five hundred; eleven, or twelve and six tenths percent, in a town LT of two thousand five hundred; ten, or eleven and five tenths, in a large city over ten thousand; five, or five and seven tenths percent, in a town two thousand five hundred to five thousand; five, or five and seven tenths, in a small city, two thousand five hundred to five thousand; four, or four and six tenths percent, in a small city five to ten thousand; three, or three and four tenths percent, in a rural area two thousand five hundred to five thousand; three, or three and four tenths, in a town five to ten thousand; two, or two and three tenths percent, in a suburb LT two thousand five hundred; two, or two and three tenths percent, in a suburb five to ten thousand; two, or two and three tenths percent, in an inner city five thousand to ten thousand; and one, or one and one tenths percent, in a suburb two thousand five hundred to five thousand.

TABLE 2. THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

Size	f	%
Rural, LT 2500	19	21.8
Town, LT 2500	11	12.6
Suburb, LT 2500	2	2.3
Rural, 2500-5000	3	3.4
Town, 2500-5000	5	5.7
Suburb, 2500-5000	1	1.1
Small City, 2500-5000	5	5.7
Town, 5000-10000	3	3.4
Suburb, 5000-10000	2	2.3
Small City, 5000-10000	4	4.6
Inner City, 5000-10000	2	2.3
Small City, over 10000	19	21.8
Large City, over 10000	10	11.5
No answer	1	1.1
Total	87	100.0

Persons Involved in the Hiring Procedure. An attempt was made to find out how involved certain persons were in the hiring process. One notes from Table 3 that sixty-one,or ninety-five and three tenths percent, thought that students and parents are the least involved while eighty-six, or one hundred percent, considered the principals most involved. Seventy-four, or eighty-nine and two tenths percent, considered superintendents as greatly involved, too.

TABLE 3. DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE HIRING PROCEDURE

	Not Involved		Involved						Total Number of Responses
			Little Involvement		Average Involvement		Great Involvement		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
School Board	24	30.4	35	44.3	8	10.2	12	15.2	79
Superintendent	9	10.8	27	32.5	19	22.8	26	33.8	83
Central Office Personnel	18	24.3	4	5.5	20	26.1	32	43.3	74
Principals	0	00.0	5	5.9	14	16.3	67	77.9	86
Teachers	43	62.3	6	7.7	13	18.8	7	10.1	69
Students	61	95.3	2	3.2	0	00.0	1	1.6	64
Parents	61	95.3	1	1.6	1	1.6	1	1.6	64

Key Decision Makers. While many people may participate and may have input into the selection process, all are not influential to the same degree when it comes to actually deciding the person who will finally be selected. Thus, the participants were asked to identify the key decision makers in hiring teachers. Table 4. shows that thirty-three, or thirty-seven and nine tenths percent, perceived the Principal and another Central Office person as they key decision makers. Twenty-four, or twenty-seven and six tenths percent, on the other hand, perceived the principal as the key decision-maker alone.

TABLE 4. KEY DECISION MAKERS IN HIRING TEACHERS

	f	%
Superintendent decides	8	9.2
Director of Personnel decides	6	6.9
Principal decides	24	27.6
Central Office decides	2	2.3
Principal and another Central Office person decides	33	37.9
Principal and Teachers decide	5	5.7
Central Office Personnel, Principal, and Teachers decide	4	4.6
Other	5	5.7
Total	87	100.0

Part II General Perception of School of Education. The effect of the reputation of institutions was also explored. In short, is it a factor in the selection of teachers. The responses of the participants, as seen in Table 5., seem to strongly suggest that it is a factor. Fifty-four, or sixty-two and one tenths percent, of the eighty-five participants who responded to this question thought that it is somewhat a factor and twenty-one, or twenty-four and one tenths percent, thought that it is an extremely important factor.

TABLE 5. REPUTATION OF INSTITUTIONS: THEIR EFFECT

	f	%
Not a factor	10	11.8
Somewhat a factor	54	63.5
Extremely important	21	24.7
Total	85	100.0

Reputation of The Department of Elementary Education, School of Education, School of Education, IUB. Table 6. shows that only fourteen, or sixteen and three tenths percent, of the eighty-six who responded to this question, were not aware of the reputation of the Department of Elementary Education at IUB; twenty, or twenty-three and three tenths percent, perceive its reputation as satisfactory; forty, or forty-six and five tenths percent, rated it as good; and twelve, or fourteen percent, considered it excellent.

TABLE 6. REPUTATION OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (IUB)

	f	%
Not aware	14	16.3
Satisfactory reputation	20	23.3
Good reputation	40	46.5
Excellent reputation	12	14.0
Total	86	100.0

Information Affecting Perceptions of the School of Education (IUB).

Reputations, in large part, are affected by information that people have about the institutions. This next aspect of the investigation dealt with this concern. Forty-eight, or fifty-six and five tenths percent, were not aware that the School of Education IUB was ranked in the Top Ten in the country. Sixty-two, or seventy-two and nine tenths, had no idea that, twice in the past several years, the School of Education IUB had received national awards for the development of new programs in Teacher Education (AACTE Awards). Sixty-one, or seventy-one and eight tenths, were unaware of the studies conducted by the IUB School of Education Placement Bureau for the last several years that revealed that the best prepared teachers in the School of Education, as perceived by employing officials, were majors in Elementary Education and Special Education.

TABLE 7. FACTORS AFFECTING REPUTATIONS OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION IUB

	Was not Aware		No		Yes		Total	
Factor	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
School of Education in Top Ten	48	56.5	20	23.5	17	20.0	85	100.0
AACTE Award	62	72.9	13	15.3	10	11.8	85	100.0
Elementary Education, Special Education Majors (Best Prepared Teachers)	61	71.8	9	10.6	15	17.6	85	100.0

State Residences of Applicants Hired as Teachers. Table 8. shows that seventy-one, or eighty-four and five tenths percent, of the eighty-four respondents hired applicants from the state of Indiana and thirteen, or fifteen and five tenths percent, from other states.

TABLE 8. STATE RESIDENCES OF APPLICANTS HIRED AS TEACHERS

	f	%
Indiana	71	84.5
Other than Indiana	13	15.5
Total	84	100.0

Educational Degree, Reputation, and Mind Set. Table 9 describes how attitude toward an applicant is affected by the reputation of an institution. Of those with Bachelor's degrees, ten, or eleven and nine tenths percent, do not consider it as a significant factor in the selection process. Fifty-four, or sixty-four and three tenths percent, consider it as somewhat of a factor. And twenty, or twenty-three and eight tenths percent, consider it extremely important.

Of the participants with Master's degrees, nine, or ten and eight tenths percent, do not consider it a significant factor; fifty-three, or sixty-three and nine tenths percent, consider it somewhat of a factor; and twenty-one, or twenty-five and three tenths percent, consider it extremely important.

Of the twenty-two Specialist degree holders, thirteen, or thirteen and six tenths percent, do not consider it a significant factor; thirteen, or fifty-nine and one tenths percent, consider it somewhat of a factor; and six, or twenty-seven and three tenths percent, consider it extremely important.

Of the twelve respondents with Doctorate degrees, seven, or fifty-eight and three tenths percent, consider it somewhat of a factor and five, or forty-one and seven tenths, consider it extremely important.

The reputation of an institution is a factor in the selection process in most instances. About twenty-five percent of the time it is extremely significant. This factor becomes increasingly important as the principal obtains advanced degrees.

TABLE 9. EDUCATIONAL DEGREE, REPUTATION, AND MIND SET

Type of degree and Location	Not a Factor		Somewhat a Factor		Extremely Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Bachelors								
Indiana University	0	0.0	13	68.4	6	31.6	19	22.6
Indiana State University	1	14.3	16	85.7	0	0.0	17	8.3
Purdue University	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	1.2
Ball State University	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0	8	9.5
Other Indiana School	4	19.0	9	42.9	8	38.1	21	25.0
University Outside	3	10.7	21	75.0	4	14.3	28	33.3
Column Total	10	11.9	54	64.3	20	23.8	84	100.0

TABLE 9. (Continued)

Type of degree and Location	Not a Factor		Somewhat a Factor		Extremely Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Masters								
Indiana University	2	5.7	21	60.0	12	34.3	35	42.2
Indiana State University	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7	6	7.2
Purdue University	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	2	2.4
Ball State University	3	23.1	7	53.8	3	23.1	13	15.7
Other Indiana School	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	7	8.4
University Outside	1	5.0	16	80.0	3	15.0	20	24.1
Column Total	9	10.8	53	63.9	21	25.3	83	100.0
Specialist								
Indiana University	1	9.1	6	54.5	4	36.4	11	50.0
Indiana State University	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Purdue University	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Ball State University	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	4.5
Other Indiana School	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
University Outside	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3	7	31.8
Column Total	3	13.6	13	59.1	6	27.3	22	100.0
Doctorate								
Indiana University			4	57.1	3	42.9	7	58.3
Indiana State University								
Purdue University			1	100.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Ball State University			0	0.0	1	100.0	1	8.3
Other Indiana School								
University Outside			2	66.7	1	33.3	3	25.0
Column Total			7	58.3	5	41.7	12	100.0

The findings suggest that the participants, regardless of the degrees they hold, have a favorable perception of the Department of Elementary Education IUB ranging from satisfactory to excellent. This confirms earlier findings relative to this item.

TABLE 10. EDUCATIONAL DEGREE IN RELATION TO GENERAL PERCEPTION OF DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IUB

Type of degree and Location	Not Aware		Satisfactory Reputation		Good Reputation		Excellent Reputation		Raw Score	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Bachelors										
Indiana University	1	5.3	4	21.1	10	52.6	4	21.1	19	22.6
Indiana State University	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4	0	0.0	7	8.3
Purdue University	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	1.2
Ball State University	2	25.0	3	37.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	8	9.5
Other Indiana School	0	0.0	7	31.8	12	54.5	3	13.6	22	26.2
University Outside	10	37.0	4	14.8	11	40.7	2	7.4	27	32.1
Column Total	13	15.5	20	23.8	40	47.6	11	13.1	8	100.0
Masters										
Indiana University	1	2.9	9	25.7	19	54.3	6	17.1	35	41.7
Indiana State University	0	0.0	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7	6	7.1
Purdue University	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	2	2.4
Ball State University	1	7.7	3	23.1	5	38.5	4	30.8	13	15.5
Other Indiana School	0	0.0	3	42.9	4	57.1	0	0.0	7	8.3
University Outside	10	47.6	3	14.3	7	33.3	1	4.8	21	25.0
Column Total	13	15.5	20	23.8	39	46.4	12	14.3	84	100.0

TABLE 10. (Continued)

Type of degree and Location	Not Aware		Satis-factory Reputation		Good Reputation		Excellent Reputation		Raw Score	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Specialist										
Indiana University	1	9.1	2	18.2	7	63.6	1	9.1	11	50.0
Indiana State University	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Purdue University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
Ball State University	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	4.5
Other Indiana School	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	4.5
University Outside	4	57.1	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	14.3	7	31.8
Column Total	6	27.3	5	22.7	8	36.4	3	13.6	22	100.0
Doctorate										
Indiana University			2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	7	58.3
Indiana State University										
Purdue University			0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Ball State University			0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	8.3
Other Indiana School										
University Outside			0	0.0	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	25.0
Column Total			2	16.7	7	58.3	3	25.0	12	100.0

Educational Degree in Relation to Top Ten Reputation. Table 11. indicates the extent to which information about the School of Education's being in the Top Ten had affected the general perceptions of the different degree

holders. Of the eighty-four with Bachelor's degrees, forty-eight, or seventy-five and one tenths percent, were not aware of this fact; twenty, or twenty-three and eight tenths percent, were but said it did not affect their perceptions; and sixteen, or nineteen percent, were and indicated that it did affect their perceptions.

Of those with Master's degrees, forty-eight, or fifty-seven and one tenth percent, were not aware of this fact; nineteen, or twenty-two and six tenths percent, were but it did not affect their perceptions; and seventeen, or twenty and two tenths percent, were and indicated that it did affect their perceptions.

Of the twenty-two Specialist degree holders, nine, or forty-two and nine tenths percent, were not aware of this fact; nine or forty-two and nine tenths percent were but it did not affect their perceptions; and three, or fourteen and three tenths percent, were and indicated that it did affect their perceptions.

Of the eight Doctorate degree holders who responded to this item, two or twenty-eight and six tenths percent, were not aware of this fact; two or twenty-eight and six tenths percent, were but it did not affect their perceptions; and four, or thirty-three and three tenths percent, were and indicated that it did affect their perceptions.

TABLE 11. EDUCATIONAL DEGREE IN RELATION TO TOP TEN REPUTATION

Type of degree and Location	Was Not Aware		No		Yes		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Bachelors								
Indiana University	7	36.8	4	21.1	8	42.1	19	22.6
Indiana State University	5	71.4	2	28.6	0	0.0	7	8.3
Purdue University	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	1.2
Ball State University	4	50.0	3	37.5	1	12.5	8	9.5
Other Indiana School	14	63.6	4	18.2	4	18.2	22	26.2
University Outside	18	66.7	6	22.2	3	11.1	27	32.1
Column Total	48	57.1	20	23.8	16	19.0	84	100.0
Masters								
Indiana University	12	34.3	11	31.4	12	34.3	35	41.7
Indiana State University	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	7.1
Purdue University	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	2	2.4
Ball State University	8	61.5	4	30.8	1	7.7	13	15.5
Other Indiana School	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	9.5
University Outside	14	70.0	3	15.0	3	15.0	20	23.8
Column Total	48	57.1	19	22.6	17	20.2	84	100.0
Specialist								
Indiana University	3	27.3	6	54.5	2	18.2	11	52.4
Indiana State University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Purdue University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Ball State University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Other Indiana School	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
University Outside	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	6	28.6
Column Total	9	42.9	9	42.9	3	14.3	21	100.0

TABLE 11. (Continued)

Type of degree and Location	Was Not Aware		No		Yes		Raw Score	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Doctorate								
Indiana University	2	28.6	2	28.6	3	42.9	7	58.3
Indiana State University								
Purdue University	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	8.3
Ball State University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Other Indiana School								
University Outside	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	25.0
Column Total	5	41.7	3	25.0	4	33.3	12	100.0

Educational Degree in Relation to AACTE Awards. Has the information about the IUB School of Education's receiving AACTE Awards affected the various degree holder's general perception? Did administrators possess such knowledges? Table 12 provides information relative to these questions.

Of the eighty-four participants with Bachelor's degrees, sixty-two, or seventy-three and eight tenths percent, were not aware of this fact; thirteen, or fifteen and five tenths percent, were but it did not affect their perceptions; and nine, or ten and seven tenths percent, were and such knowledge did affect their perceptions.

Of those with Master's degrees, sixty-two, or seventy-three and eight tenths percent, were not aware of this fact; twelve, or 14.3%, were but it

did not affect their perceptions; and ten, or eleven and nine tenths percent, were and such knowledge did affect their perceptions.

Of the twenty-one Specialist degree holders who responded to this item, sixteen, or seventy-six and two tenths percent, were not aware of this fact; four, or nineteen percent, were but it did not affect their perceptions; and one, or four and eight tenths percent, were and such knowledge did affect their perceptions.

Of the twelve with Doctorate degrees, ten, or eighty-three and three tenths percent, were not aware of this fact; one, or eight and three tenths percent, was but it did not affect their perceptions; and only one, or eight and three tenths percent, was affected by such knowledge.

TABLE 12. EDUCATIONAL DEGREE IN RELATION TO AACTE AWARDS

Type of degree and Location	Was Not Aware		No		Yes		Raw	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Bachelors								
Indiana University	11	57.9	4	21.1	4	21.1	19	22.6
Indiana State University	5	71.4	2	28.6	0	0.0	7	18.3
Purdue University	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	1.2
Ball State University	6	75.0	1	12.5	1	12.5	8	9.5
Other Indiana School	16	72.7	2	9.1	4	18.2	22	26.2
University Outside	24	88.9	3	11.1	0	0.0	27	32.1
Column Total	62	73.8	13	15.5	9	10.7	84	100.0

TABLE 12. (Continued)

Type of degree and Location	Was Not Aware		No		Yes		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Masters								
Indiana University	19	54.3	9	25.7	7	20.0	35	41.7
Indiana State University	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	7.1
Purdue University	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.4
Ball State University	10	76.9	2	15.4	1	7.7	13	15.5
Other Indiana School	7	87.5	0	0.0	1	12.5	8	9.5
University Outside	19	95.0	0	0.0	1	5.0	20	23.8
Column Total	62	73.8	12	14.3	10	11.9	84	100.0
Specialist								
Indiana University	6	54.5	4	36.4	1	9.1	11	52.4
Indiana State University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Purdue University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Ball State University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Other Indiana School	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
University Outside	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	28.6
Column Total	16	76.2	4	19.0	1	4.8	21	100.0
Doctorate								
Indiana University	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	58.3
Indiana State University								
Purdue University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Ball State University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3
Other Indiana School								
University Outside	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	25.0
Column Total	10	83.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	12	100.0

Educational Degree in Relation to Best Prepared Teachers Survey.

Table 13. describes how the information that Elementary Education and Special Education majors are perceived as the best prepared majors in the School of Education IUB has affected the general perceptions of the different degree holders.

Of the eighty-four subjects with Bachelor's degrees, sixty-one, or seventy-two and six tenths percent, were not aware of such survey results; nine, or ten and seven tenths percent, were but it did not affect their perceptions; and fourteen, or sixteen and seven tenths percent, were affected by such knowledge.

Of the twenty-one Specialist degree holders who responded to this item, sixteen, or seventy-six and two tenths percent, were not aware of these survey results: two, or nine and five tenths percent, were but it did not affect their perceptions; and three, or fourteen and three tenths percent, were affected by such knowledge.

Of the twelve with Doctorate degree, five, or forty-one and seven tenths percent, were not aware of these survey results; three, or twenty-five percent, were but it did not affect their perceptions; and four, or thirty-three and three tenths percent, were affected by such knowledge.

TABLE 13. EDUCATIONAL DEGREE IN RELATION TO BEST PREPARED TEACHERS' SURVEY

Type of degree and Location	Was Not Aware		No		Yes		Raw Score	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Bachelors								
Indiana University	14	73.7	2	10.5	3	15.8	19	22.6
Indiana State University	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3	7	8.3
Purdue University	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	1.2
Ball State University	6	75.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	8	9.5
Other Indiana School	14	63.6	3	13.6	5	22.7	22	26.2
University Outside	22	81.5	2	7.4	3	11.1	27	32.1
Column Total	61	72.6	9	10.7	14	16.7	84	100.0
Masters								
Indiana University	22	62.9	6	17.1	7	20.0	35	41.7
Indiana State University	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	7.1
Purdue University	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.4
Ball State University	9	69.2	1	7.7	3	23.1	13	15.5
Other Indiana School	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	8	9.5
University Outside	18	90.0	0	0.0	2	10.0	20	23.8
Column Total	61	72.6	9	10.7	14	16.7	84	100.0
Specialist								
Indiana University	7	63.6	2	18.2	2	18.2	11	52.4
Indiana State University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Purdue University	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
Ball State University	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	4.8
Other Indiana School	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8
University Outside	6	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	28.6
Column Total	16	76.2	2	9.5	3	14.3	21	100.0

TABLE 13. (Continued)

Type of degree and Location	Was Not Aware		No		Yes		Raw Score	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Doctorate								
Indiana University	5	71.4			2	28.6	7	58.3
Indiana State University								
Purdue University	1	100.0			0	0.0	1	8.3
Ball State University	1	100.0			0	0.0	1	8.3
Other Indiana School								
University Outside	3	100.0			0	0.0	3	25.0
Column Total	10	83.3			2	16.7	12	100.0

Part III Significant Factors in the Selection Process. Various factors were listed in the questionnaire which could contribute to the selection of a given candidate. The participants were asked to assess those factors and to indicate when those factors were important. Three different stages in the employment process were described. The First Stage is the Initial Contact Stage whereby a candidate makes contact via a letter or telephone call inquiring about openings and/or requesting an application form. In the Second Stage, there is access to information not previously available and a decision is to be made whether or not to invite a given candidate in for an interview. This information may have been provided in the form of a letter, an application form, a vita or resume, a person's credentials, or quite possibly in conversation. At the last and Third Stage, an in-depth interview is conducted with candidates and a decision is to be made as to whom to employ.

Factors of a Professional Nature. Tables 14, 15, and 16 identify those factors of a professional nature which were considerations at the various stages. The following four factors (as related to Stage One) were mentioned by approximately half (or more) of the participants in each category.

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	59	67.8	66	74.1
Reputation of School of Education	55	63.2	57	64.3
Personal Acquaintance with I.U. Faculty Members	53	60.9	51	57.8
Reputation of Placement Bureau	46	52.9	51	57.8

TABLE 14. FACTORS OF A PROFESSIONAL NATURE: INITIAL CONTACT STAGE

Factors of a Professional Nature	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	15	17.25	25	28.75	19	21.85	59	67.85
Reputation of School of Education	14	16.10	25	28.75	16	18.40	55	63.25
Reputation of Dept. of Elem. Educ.	14	16.10	22	25.30	17	19.55	53	60.95
Personal acquaintance of faculty members	19	21.85	6	6.90	14	16.10	39	44.85
Reputation of given program	16	18.40	13	14.95	8	9.20	37	42.55
Reputation of Placement Bureau	14	16.10	17	19.55	15	17.25	46	52.90
General Teaching Competency	1	1.15	8	9.20	15	17.25	24	27.60
Student Teaching Performance	0	0.0	6	6.90	28	32.20	34	39.10
Experience in special student teaching project	10	11.50	10	11.50	6	6.90	26	29.90
Pre-student teaching experiences	3	3.45	16	18.40	12	13.80	31	35.65
Related experience with children	3	3.45	15	17.25	9	10.35	27	31.05
Grades in professional courses	2	2.30	17	19.55	13	14.95	32	36.80
Grades in other university work	3	3.45	15	17.25	11	12.65	29	33.35
Philosophy of education	0	0.0	4	4.60	11	12.65	15	17.25
Philosophy as related to classroom management	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	16.10	14	16.10
Implement classroom management philosophy	0	0.0	2	2.30	7	8.05	9	10.35
Credentials supervising student teaching	1	1.15	8	9.20	19	21.85	28	32.20
Credentials collegiate faculty	2	2.30	14	16.10	11	12.65	27	31.05
Credentials others	3	3.45	15	17.25	10	11.50	28	32.20
Candidate's written statements	2	2.30	13	14.95	21	24.15	36	41.40

TABLE 14. (Continued)

Factors of a Professional Nature	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	7	7.63	36	41.42	23	27.25	66	74.12
Reputation of School of Education	6	6.54	25	29.43	26	30.52	57	64.31
Reputation of Dept. of Elem. Educ.	5	5.45	25	29.43	21	25.07	51	57.77
Personal acquaintance of faculty members	13	15.26	16	19.62	13	15.26	42	49.96
Reputation of given program	12	14.17	12	14.17	10	11.99	34	39.24
Reputation of Placement Bureau	21	25.07	18	21.80	12	14.17	51	57.77
General Teaching Competency	0	0.0	4	4.35	23	27.25	27	31.61
Student Teaching Performance	1	1.09	1	1.09	28	32.70	30	34.88
Experience in special student teaching project	6	6.54	10	11.99	14	16.35	30	34.88
Pre-student teaching experiences	2	2.18	12	14.17	17	20.71	31	35.97
Related experience with children	4	4.35	11	13.08	15	18.53	30	34.88
Grades in professional courses	2	2.18	14	16.35	20	23.98	36	41.42
Grades in other university work	2	2.18	19	22.89	13	15.26	34	39.24
Philosophy of education	0	0.0	4	4.36	11	13.08	15	18.53
Philosophy as related to classroom management	0	0.0	1	1.09	9	10.90	10	11.99
Implement classroom management philosophy	2	2.18	1	1.09	4	4.36	7	7.63
Credentials supervising student teaching	1	1.09	2	2.18	22	26.16	25	29.43
Credentials collegiate faculty	1	1.09	5	5.45	17	20.71	23	27.25
Credentials others	1	1.09	12	14.17	13	15.26	26	30.52
Candidate's written statements	2	2.18	14	16.35	23	27.25	39	44.69

At the Second Stage, a rather large cluster of factors emerged. Some distinct variations in the perceptions of the two groups can be readily noted.

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.			55	62.1
Reputation of School of Education			54	61.0
Reputation of Dept. of Elem Educ.			50	56.7
General Teaching Competency	45	51.8	55	62.1
Student Teaching Performance	52	59.8	75	83.9
Experience in Special Student Teaching Programs			46	52.3
Pre-Student Teaching Experience			56	63.2
Related Experience with Children			52	58.9
Grades in Professional Courses	50	57.5	64	74.1
Grades in Other University Work	48	55.2	56	63.2
Credentials/Student Teaching Supervisors	48	55.2	62	69.8
Credentials/Collegiate Faculty	49	56.4	62	69.8
Credentials/Others	45	51.8	62	69.8
Candidates Written Statement	50	57.5	58	65.4

TABLE 15. FACTORS OF A PROFESSIONAL NATURE: SECOND STAGE

Factors of a Professional Nature	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	5	5.75	15	17.25	12	13.80	32	36.80
Reputation of School of Education	6	6.90	12	13.80	10	11.50	28	32.20
Reputation of Dept. of Elem. Educ.	5	5.75	12	13.80	10	11.50	27	31.05
Personal acquaintance of faculty members	5	5.75	8	9.20	14	16.10	27	31.05
Reputation of given program	7	8.05	16	18.40	9	10.35	32	36.80
Reputation of Placement Bureau	5	5.75	13	14.95	12	13.80	30	34.50
General Teaching Competency	0	0.0	8	9.20	37	42.55	45	51.75
Student Teaching Performance	0	0.0	4	4.60	48	55.20	52	59.80
Experience in special student teaching project	3	3.45	14	16.10	16	18.40	33	37.95
Pre-student teaching experiences	3	3.45	18	20.70	15	17.25	36	41.40
Related experience with children	2	2.30	20	23.00	19	21.85	41	47.15
Grades in professional courses	1	1.15	25	28.75	24	27.60	50	57.50
Grades in other university work	2	2.30	25	28.75	21	24.15	48	55.20
Philosophy of education	0	0.0	3	3.45	21	24.15	24	27.60
Philosophy as related to classroom management	1	1.15	2	2.30	22	25.30	25	28.75
Implement classroom management philosophy	0	0.0	4	4.60	24	27.60	28	32.20
Credentials supervising student teaching	1	1.15	14	16.10	33	37.95	48	55.20
Credentials collegiate faculty	3	3.45	20	23.00	26	29.90	49	56.35
Credentials others	6	6.90	19	21.85	20	23.00	45	51.75
Candidate's written statements	0	0.0	20	23.00	30	34.50	50	57.50

TABLE 15. (continued)

Factors of a Professional Nature	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	3	3.27	31	35.97	21	24.07	55	62.13
Reputation of School of Education	0	0.0	25	29.43	29	33.79	54	61.04
Reputation of Dept. of Elem. Educ.	1	1.09	23	27.25	26	30.52	50	56.68
Personal acquaintance of faculty members	7	7.63	12	14.17	16	19.62	35	40.33
Reputation of given program	7	7.63	17	20.71	13	15.26	37	42.51
Reputation of Placement Bureau	5	5.45	13	15.26	13	15.26	31	35.97
General Teaching Competency	1	1.09	3	3.27	51	57.77	55	62.13
Student Teaching Performance	0	0.0	11	13.08	64	71.94	75	83.93
Experience in special student teaching project	3	3.27	20	23.09	23	27.25	46	52.32
Pre-student teaching experiences	5	5.45	20	23.98	31	35.97	56	63.22
Related experience with children	2	2.18	24	28.34	26	30.52	52	58.86
Grades in professional courses	1	1.09	27	31.61	36	41.42	64	74.12
Grades in other university work	10	11.99	32	37.06	19	22.89	56	63.22
Philosophy of education	1	1.09	10	11.99	29	33.79	40	45.78
Philosophy as related to classroom management	1	1.09	3	3.27	26	30.52	30	34.88
Implement classroom management philosophy	1	1.09	2	2.18	22	26.16	25	29.43
Credentials supervising student teaching	0	0.0	6	10.62	56	63.22	62	69.76
Credentials collegiate faculty	0	0.0	11	13.08	51	57.77	62	69.76
Credentials others	0	0.0	21	25.07	41	46.87	62	69.76
Candidate's written statements	0	0.0	17	20.71	41	46.87	58	65.40

The factors which were rated as Very Important at the Second Stage by the principals and/or teachers were:

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
General Teaching Competency			51	57.8
Student Teaching Competency	48	55.2	64	71.9
Credentials/Student Teaching Supervisors			56	63.2
Credentials/Collegiate Faculty			51	57.8

The principals and teachers differed significantly in their ratings, at the .000 to .03 level of confidence, of the following factors:

Reputation of I.U.
Reputation of School of Education
Personal Acquaintance with Faculty Members
Student Teaching Performance
Pre-Student Teaching Experiences
Credentials/Student Teaching Supervisors
Credentials/Collegiate Faculty
Credentials/Others

The teachers tended to rate these factors much higher than principals.

The following factors were mentioned most frequently by principals and/or teachers at the Interview Stage:

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
General Teaching Competency	55	63.25	82	91.6
Student Teaching Performance	53	60.0	76	85.0
Experience in Special Student Teaching Projects			49	55.6
Pre-Student Teaching Experience			62	69.8

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Related Experience with Children	44	50.6	57	64.3
Philosophy of Education	66	75.9	77	86.1
Philosophy as Related to Classroom Management	71	81.6	83	92.6
Implementation of Classroom Management Philosophy	68	78.2	80	89.4
Credentials/Student Teaching Supervisors			64	71.9
Credentials/Collegiate Faculty			52	58.9
Credentials/Others			51	57.8

TABLE 16. FACTORS OF A PROFESSIONAL NATURE: INTERVIEW STAGE

Factors of a Professional Nature	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	4	4.60	8	9.20	6	6.90	18	20.70
Reputation of School of Education	5	5.75	4	4.60	8	9.20	17	19.55
Reputation of Dept. of Elem. Educ.	4	4.60	6	6.90	10	11.50	20	23.00
Personal acquaintance of faculty members	3	3.45	5	5.75	9	10.35	17	19.55
Reputation of given program	4	4.60	9	10.35	13	14.95	26	29.90
Reputation of Placement Bureau	6	6.90	7	8.05	3	3.45	16	18.40
General Teaching Competency	0	0.0	5	5.75	50	57.50	55	63.25
Student Teaching Performance	0	0.0	3	3.45	50	57.50	53	60.95
Experience in special student teaching project	3	3.45	13	14.95	20	23.00	36	41.40
Pre-student teaching experiences	3	3.45	19	21.85	19	21.85	41	47.15
Related experience with children	4	4.60	17	19.55	24	27.60	44	50.60
Grades in professional courses	1	1.15	10	11.50	18	20.70	29	33.35
Grades in other university work	1	1.15	10	11.50	16	18.40	27	31.05
Philosophy of education	0	0.0	9	10.35	57	65.55	66	75.90
Philosophy as related to classroom management	0	0.0	2	2.30	69	79.35	71	81.65
Implement classroom management philosophy	0	0.0	3	3.45	65	74.75	68	78.20
Credentials supervising student teaching	1	1.15	5	5.75	32	36.80	38	43.70
Credentials collegiate faculty	1	1.15	9	10.35	18	20.70	28	32.20
Credentials others	1	1.15	11	12.65	19	21.85	31	35.65
Candidate's written statements	0	0.0	9	10.35	24	27.60	33	37.95

TABLE 16. (continued)

Factors of a Professional Nature	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	3	3.27	18	21.80	16	19.62	37	42.51
Reputation of School of Education	0	0.0	11	13.08	22	26.16	33	38.15
Reputation of Dept. of Elem. Educ.	0	0.0	12	14.17	20	23.98	32	37.06
Personal acquaintance of faculty members	7	7.63	13	15.26	19	22.89	39	44.69
Reputation of given program	6	6.54	14	16.35	16	19.62	36	41.42
Reputation of Placement Bureau	3	3.27	2	2.18	7	7.63	12	14.17
General Teaching Competency	1	1.09	4	4.36	77	86.11	82	91.56
Student Teaching Performance	0	0.0	10	11.99	66	74.12	76	85.02
Experience in special student teaching project	3	3.27	21	25.07	25	29.43	49	55.59
Pre-student teaching experience	5	5.45	23	27.25	34	39.24	62	69.76
Related experience with children	2	2.18	29	33.79	26	30.50	57	64.31
Grades in professional courses	3	3.27	14	16.35	22	26.16	39	44.69
Grades in other university work	3	3.27	18	21.80	9	10.90	30	34.88
Philosophy of education	5	5.45	14	16.35	58	65.40	77	86.11
Philosophy as related to classroom management	2	2.18	5	5.45	76	85.02	83	92.65
Implement classroom management philosophy	3	3.27	4	4.36	73	81.75	80	89.38
Credentials supervising student teaching	0	0.0	5	5.45	59	66.49	64	71.94
Credentials collegiate faculty	0	0.0	2	2.18	50	56.68	52	58.86
Credentials others	0	0.0	12	14.17	39	44.69	51	57.77
Candidate's written statements	0	0.0	8	9.81	32	37.06	40	45.78

Regarded as very important by the principals and/or teachers at this stage were the following:

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
General Teaching Competency	50	57.5	77	86.1
Student Teaching Performance	50	57.5	66	74.1
Philosophy of Education	57	65.6	58	65.4
Philosophy, Classroom Management	69	79.4	76	85.0
Implementation of Philosophy, Classroom Management	65	74.8	73	81.8
Credentials Supervising Student Teaching			59	66.5
Credentials Collegiate Faculty			50	56.7
Credentials Others			39	44.7

Principals and teachers differed significantly in their ratings, at the .000 to .02 per cent level of confidence, of the following factors:

Reputation of I.U.
Reputation of School of Education
Reputation of Department of Elementary Education
Personal Acquaintance with Faculty Members
General Teaching Competency
Student Teaching Performance
Pre-Student Teaching Experience
Credentials/Student Teaching Supervisors
Credentials/Collegiate Faculty
Credentials/Others

Again, the teachers rated these factors higher than the principals.

Factors of Personal Nature. In Tables 17, 18, and 19, one sees the factors of personal nature which were considerations in the selection process.

At the Initial Contact Stage, no factor emerged as being significant at this juncture. Not one single factor was chosen as "very important". There was no significant variance in the way the principals or teachers rated these factors.

TABLE 17. FACTORS OF PERSONAL NATURE: INITIAL CONTACT

	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
Factors of Personal Nature	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personality	0	0.0	3	3.45	22	25.30	25	28.75
Ability to work with others	0	0.0	1	1.15	19	21.85	20	23.00
Diversity of personal interest and hobbies	1	1.15	8	9.20	4	4.60	13	14.95
Physical Appearance	2	2.30	9	10.35	14	16.10	25	28.75
Personal Grooming (clothes)	1	1.15	6	6.90	16	18.40	23	26.45
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College participant)	3	3.45	12	13.8	11	12.65	26	29.90
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College leadership roles)	1	1.15	10	11.50	15	17.25	26	29.90
Work Experience	1	1.15	4	4.60	17	19.55	22	25.30
Travel Experience	4	4.60	12	13.80	4	4.60	20	23.00
Maturity	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	18.40	16	18.40
Marriage Status	24	27.60	5	5.75	0	0.0	29	33.35
Military Experiences	19	21.85	7	8.05	2	2.30	28	32.20

TABLE 17. (Continued)

Factors of Personal Nature	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personality	0	0.0	3	3.27	18	21.80	21	25.07
Ability to work with others	1	1.09	1	1.09	11	13.08	13	15.26
Diversity of personal interest and hobbies	0	0.0	9	10.90	9	10.90	18	21.80
Physical Appearance	0	0.0	2	2.18	21	25.07	23	27.25
Personal Grooming (clothes)	0	0.0	2	2.18	14	16.35	16	19.62
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College participant)	4	4.36	14	16.35	7	7.63	25	29.43
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College leadership roles)	4	4.36	11	13.08	7	7.63	22	26.16
Work Experience	1	1.09	9	10.90	18	21.80	28	32.70
Travel Experience	6	6.54	14	16.35	3	3.27	23	27.25
Maturity	0	0.0	3	3.27	16	19.62	19	22.89
Marriage Status	22	26.16	8	9.81	2	2.18	32	37.06
Military Experience	17	20.71	6	6.54	1	1.09	24	28.34

The overall picture changed slightly at the Second Stage. Some factors worth noting include:

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Extra Curricular Activities (High school/college participant)	46	52.9	55	62.1
Extra Curricular Activities (High school/college leadership roles)			52	58.8
Work Experience			42	48.0

However, no single factor was regarded by the participants as "very important" at this stage.

TABLE 18. FACTORS OF PERSONAL NATURE: SECOND STAGE

	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
Factors of Personal Nature	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personality	0	0.0	1	1.15	30	34.50	31	35.65
Ability to work with others	0	0.0	2	2.30	31	35.65	33	37.95
Diversity of personal interest and hobbies	1	1.15	18	20.70	14	16.10	33	37.95
Physical Appearance	0	0.0	7	8.05	18	20.70	25	28.75
Personal Grooming (clothes)	0	0.0	3	3.45	23	26.45	26	29.90
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College participant)	1	1.15	31	35.65	14	16.10	46	52.90
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College leadership roles)	0	0.0	25	28.75	17	19.55	42	48.30
Work Experience	0	0.0	13	14.95	29	33.35	42	48.30
Travel Experience	5	5.75	24	27.60	5	5.75	34	39.10
Maturity	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	33.35	29	33.35
Marriage Status	10	11.50	11	12.65	2	2.30	23	26.45
Military Experiences	13	14.95	12	13.80	2	2.30	27	31.05

TABLE 18. (Continued)

Factors of Personal Nature	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personality	1	1.09	4	4.36	36	41.42	41	46.83
Ability to work with others	1	1.09	2	2.18	36	41.42	39	44.69
Diversity of personal interest and hobbies	1	1.09	28	32.70	15	18.53	44	50.14
Physical Appearance	1	1.09	5	5.45	26	30.52	32	37.06
Personal Grooming (clothes)	0	0.0	4	4.36	26	30.52	30	34.88
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College participant)	4	4.36	33	38.15	18	21.80	55	62.13
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College leadership roles)	4	4.36	27	31.61	21	25.07	52	58.86
Work Experience	1	1.09	18	21.80	38	43.60	57	64.31
Travel Experience	8	9.81	27	31.61	7	7.63	42	47.96
Maturity	1	1.09	4	4.36	30	34.88	35	40.33
Marriage Status	17	20.71	19	22.89	2	2.18	38	43.60
Military Experiences	19	22.89	11	13.08	2	2.18	32	37.06

The following factors drew a considerable number of responses at the Interview Stage:

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Personality	65	74.8	74	82.8
Extra Curricular Activities (High school/college leadership roles)	55	63.2	82	91.6
Work Experience	53	61.0	76	85.0
Travel Experience			49	55.6
Maturity			62	69.8
Marriage Status			57	64.3

Perceived as very important at this stage were the following:

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Personality	62	71.3	68	76.3
Extra Curricular Activities (High school/college leadership roles)	50	57.5	77	86.1
Work Experience	50	57.5	66	74.1

Significant difference was found at the .04 to .05 level of confidence in the ratings of principals and teachers on the following factors:

Physical Appearance

Work Experience.

Teachers clearly see these factors as more significant than principals.

TABLE 19. FACTORS OF PERSONAL NATURE: INTERVIEW STAGE

	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
Factors of Personal Nature	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personality	0	0.0	3	3.45	62	71.30	65	74.75
Ability to work with others	5	5.75	4	4.60	8	9.20	17	19.55
Diversity of personal interest and hobbies	4	4.60	6	6.90	10	11.50	20	23.00
Physical Appearance	3	3.45	5	5.75	9	10.35	17	19.55
Personal Grooming (clothes)	4	4.60	9	10.35	13	14.95	26	29.90
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College participant)	6	6.90	7	8.05	3	3.45	16	18.40
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College leadership roles)	0	0.0	5	5.75	50	57.50	55	63.25
Work Experience	0	0.0	3	3.45	50	57.50	53	60.95
Travel Experience	3	3.45	13	14.95	20	23.00	36	41.40
Maturity	3	3.45	19	21.85	19	21.85	41	47.15
Marriage Status	3	3.45	17	19.55	24	27.60	44	50.60
Military Experiences	1	1.15	10	11.50	18	20.70	29	33.35

TABLE 19. (Continued)

Factors of Personal Nature	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personality	1	1.09	5	5.45	68	76.30	74	82.84
Ability to work with others	0	0.0	11	13.08	22	26.16	33	38.15
Diversity of personal interest and hobbies	0	0.0	12	14.17	20	23.98	32	37.06
Physical Appearance	7	7.63	13	15.26	19	22.89	39	44.69
Personal Grooming (clothes)	6	6.54	14	16.35	16	19.62	36	41.42
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College participant)	3	3.27	2	2.18	7	7.63	12	14.17
Extra Curricular Activities (H.S./College leadership roles)	1	1.09	4	4.36	77	86.11	82	91.56
Work Experience	0	0.0	10	11.99	66	74.12	76	85.02
Travel Experience	3	3.27	21	25.07	25	29.43	49	55.59
Maturiry	5	5.45	23	27.25	34	39.24	62	69.76
Marriage Status	2	2.18	29	33.79	26	30.52	57	64.31
Military Experiences	3	3.27	14	16.35	22	26.16	39	44.69

Other Factors. Tables 20, 21, and 22 indicate other factors which appear to be considerations--the employment process.

Fifty, or 56.7% of the teachers thought that the factor, Local Resident, was important at the Initial Contact Stage. However, no factor was considered as very important by both principals and teachers. The groups differed significantly on the following factors at the .004 to .05 level of confidence:

No degree beyond B.S.
No experience
Local resident

TABLE 20. OTHER FACTORS: INITIAL CONTACT

Other Factors	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No degree beyond B.S.	18	20.70	14	16.70	2	2.30	34	39.10
No experience	17	19.55	12	13.80	5	5.75	34	39.10
Satisfactory (or better) score on some test - school district	18	20.70	5	5.75	2	2.30	25	28.75
Local resident	15	17.25	17	19.55	8	9.20	40	46.00
Evidence of permanence	4	4.60	12	13.80	9	10.35	25	28.75
Enthusiasm for our community	2	2.30	7	8.05	7	8.05	16	18.40
Enthusiasm for school system	0	0.0	6	6.90	13	14.95	19	21.85
Prior knowledge of candidate	12	13.80	16	18.40	11	12.65	39	44.85

Other Factors	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No degree beyond B.S.	7	7.63	16	19.62	16	19.62	39	44.69
No experience	7	7.63	11	13.08	18	21.80	36	41.42
Satisfactory (or better) score on some test - school district	4	4.36	12	14.17	3	3.27	19	22.89
Local resident	10	11.99	11	13.08	29	33.79	50	56.68
Evidence of permanence	4	4.36	3	3.27	16	19.62	23	27.25
Enthusiasm for our community	2	2.18	4	4.36	15	18.53	21	25.07
Enthusiasm for school system	1	1.09	4	4.36	15	18.53	20	23.98
Prior knowledge of candidate	4	4.36	10	11.99	27	31.61	41	46.87

At the Second Stage, the following factors drew considerable response from the teachers:

	f	%
No Degree beyond B.S.	48	54.5
No Experience	51	57.8
Evidence of Permanence	47	53.4
Prior Knowledge of Candidate	47	53.4

Factors where principals and teachers differed significantly, at the .000 to .05 level of confidence, were:

No Degree beyond B.S.

No experience

Satisfactory or (better score) on some test -- school district

Local Resident

Evidence of Permanence

Prior knowledge of Candidate

TABLE 21. OTHER FACTORS: SECOND STAGE

Other Factors	Principals: Not Important f	%	Has Some Significance f	%	Very Important f	%	Raw Total f	%
No degree beyond B.S.	9	10.35	18	20.70	5	5.75	32	36.80
No experience	8	9.20	15	17.25	9	10.35	32	36.80
Satisfactory (or better) score on some test - school district	5	5.75	8	9.20	3	3.45	16	18.40
Local resident	7	8.05	12	13.80	6	6.90	25	28.75
Evidence of permanence	0	0.0	17	19.55	8	9.20	25	28.75
Enthusiasm for our community	2	2.30	7	8.05	17	19.55	26	29.90
Enthusiasm for school system	0	0.0	9	10.35	19	21.85	28	32.20
Prior knowledge of candidate	4	4.60	12	13.80	14	16.10	30	34.50

Other Factors	Teachers: Not Important f	%	Has Some Significance f	%	Very Important f	%	Raw Total f	%
No degree beyond B.S.	9	10.90	21	25.07	18	21.80	48	54.50
No experience	8	9.81	19	22.89	24	28.34	51	57.77
Satisfactory (or better)	5	5.45	20	23.98	5	5.45	30	34.88
Local resident	3	3.27	13	15.26	27	31.61	43	49.05
Evidence of permanence	4	4.36	15	18.53	28	32.70	47	53.41
Enthusiasm for our community	2	2.18	7	7.63	31	35.97	40	45.78
Enthusiasm for school system	0	0.0	9	10.90	25	29.43	34	39.24
Prior knowledge of candidate	3	3.27	13	15.26	31	35.97	47	53.41

Factors which drew considerable response from principals and/or teachers were as follows at the Interview Stage:

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
No Experience			49	55.6
Local Resident			49	55.6
Evidence of Permanence	50	57.5	71	79.6
Enthusiasm for Community	60	69.0	75	83.9
Enthusiasm for School System	63	72.4	77	86.1

The principals and/or teachers considered the following factors very important.

	Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%
Evidence of Permanence			47	53.4
Enthusiasm for Community	46	52.9	52	58.9
Enthusiasm for School System	51	58.6	62	69.7

Significant variance was found in the ratings of principals and teachers at the .05 level:

No Degree beyond B.S.
No Experience
Local Resident
Evidence of Permanence
Enthusiasm for School System
Prior Knowledge of Candidate

TABLE 22. OTHER FACTORS: INTERVIEW STAGE

	Principals							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
Other Factors	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No degree beyond B.S.	4	4.60	9	10.35	6	6.90	19	21.85
No experience	2	2.30	10	11.50	9	10.35	21	24.15
Satisfactory (or better score on some test - school district	5	5.75	7	8.05	4	4.60	16	18.40
Local resident	3	3.45	9	10.35	8	9.20	20	23.00
Evidence of permanence	3	3.45	27	31.05	20	23.00	50	57.50
Enthusiasm for our community	2	2.30	12	13.80	46	52.90	60	69.00
Enthusiasm for school system	1	1.15	11	12.65	51	58.65	63	72.45
Prior knowledge of candidate	6	6.90	8	9.20	10	11.50	24	27.60

	Teachers							
	Not Important		Has Some Significance		Very Important		Raw Total	
Other Factors	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No degree beyong B.S.	5	5.45	16	19.62	15	18.55	36	41.42
No experience	9	10.90	15	18.53	25	29.43	49	55.59
Satisfactory (or better) score on some test - school district	6	6.54	10	11.99	7	7.63	23	27.25
Local resident	5	5.45	12	14.17	32	37.06	49	55.59
Evidence of permanence	4	4.36	20	23.98	47	53.41	71	79.57
Enthusiasm for our community	1	1.09	22	26.16	52	58.86	75	83.93
Enthusiasm for school system	1	1.09	14	16.35	62	69.76	77	86.11
Prior knowledge of candidate	1	1.09	10	11.99	30	34.88	41	46.87

The Right to Privacy Act. The last area of investigation in this section of the questionnaire was related to the impact of the Right to Privacy

Act. Should students <u>not</u> sign the waiver statement (on reference forms), then confidentiality would not be maintained. Table 23 provides data as to the reactions of the respondents as to the credibility of statements which are no longer confidential.

TABLE 23. RESPONSES: RIGHT TO PRIVACY*

	P	T	
Yes	23	15	38
No	30	37	67
No thought given	29	29	58
	82	81	163

Chi-square test of significance, 2 degrees of freedom

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$$

χ^2 = chi square K = number of categories or groups

o = observed frequency in a category

e = expected frequency in a category

$$e = \frac{\text{row total} \times \text{column total}}{\text{grand total}}$$

$e_{py} = \frac{38 \times 82}{163} = 19.12$ $e_{tn} = \frac{67 \times 81}{163} = 33.29$

$e_{ty} = \frac{38 \times 81}{163} = 18.88$ $e_{pnt} = \frac{58 \times 82}{163} = 29.18$

$e_{pn} = \frac{67 \times 82}{163} = 33.71$ $e_{tnt} = \frac{58 \times 81}{163} = 28.82$

	Principals	Teachers
Yes	o = 23, e = 19.12	o = 15, e = 18.88
No	o = 30, e = 33.71	o = 37, e = 33.29
No thought given	o = 29, e = 29.18	o = 29, e = 28.82

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(23-19.12)^2}{19.12} + \frac{(15-18.88)^2}{18.88} + \frac{(30-33.71)^2}{33.71} + \frac{(37-33.29)^2}{33.29} + \frac{(29-29.18)^2}{29.18} + \frac{(29-28.82)^2}{28.82}$$

$$= \frac{(3.88)^2}{19.12} + \frac{(3.88)^2}{18.88} + \frac{(3.71)^2}{33.71} + \frac{(3.71)^2}{33.29} + \frac{(-.18)^2}{29.18} + \frac{(.18)^2}{28.82}$$

$$= .787 + .797 + .408 + .413 + .001 + .001$$

$\chi^2 = 2.407$ Tabled $\chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$

*Yes = Makes a Difference; No = Does not Make a Difference; No Thought Given = Credibility Question Never Consider

From Table 23 it cannot be concluded that the differences noted are statistically significant.

It is not known if the two populations have the same variance, so an F test of the sample variances was performed. One must set an α level to test the degree of significance of the F test. This α level does not need to be same as the α level designated for the t-test. F is computed as:

$$F = \frac{\text{larger } s^2}{\text{smaller } s^2}$$

If the probability for F is greater than α, one assumes that $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$; t is based on the pooled-variance estimate for σ_p^2. If the probability for F is less than or equal to α, $\sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$; t is based on the separate variance estimate for σ_p^2.

Part IV The Final Decision. In an attempt to find out what participants regarded as crucial factors in the final decision to hire an applicant, they were asked to go over the factors in Part III of the Questionnaire and identify the three most significant factors in this decision. All responses were placed in one of three categories: Professional; Personal; and Other.

Factors of a Professional Nature. Table 24 shows the factors mentioned most frequently. Though identical, there was a slightly different ranking.

Principals	f
Teaching Competency	29
Classroom Management	26
Student Teaching Performance	17
Philosophy of Education (General)	15
Philosophy (specifically classroom management)	13
Credentials/Student Teaching Supervisors	13

Teachers	f
Teaching Competency	30
Student Teaching Performance	23
Credentials/Student Teaching Supervisores	21
Philosophy of Education (General)	15
Classroom Management	15
Philosophy (specifically classroom management)	12

TABLE 24. THE FINAL DECISION: FACTORS O

Factors of Professional Nature	Rank One							
	Principals		Teachers		Sum Total		Principal	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reputation of I.U.	3	3.8	1	1.1	4	2.4	0	0.0
Reputation of School of Education								
Reputation of Department of Elementary Education	3	3.8	1	1.1	4	2.4	1	1.3
Personal Acquaintance of Faculty Member	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6		
Reputation of a given program	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6		
Reputation of the Placement Bureau								
General Teaching Competency	20	25.6	24	27.3	44	26.5	5	6.5
Student Teaching Performance	9	11.5	10	11.4	19	11.4	4	5.2
Experience in a Special Student Teaching Project	0	0.0	3	100.0	3	1.8	0	0.0
Pre Student Teaching Experiences							1	1.3
Related Experience with Children							1	1.3
Grades in Professional Courses	0	0.0	2	2.3	2	1.2	1	1.3
Grades in Other University Work	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6		
Philosophy of Education	10	12.8	2	2.3	12	7.2	4	5.2
Philosophy as Related to Classroom Management	2	2.6	1	1.1	3	1.8	7	9.1
Implement Classroom Management Philosophy	3	3.8	2	2.3	5	3.0	11	14.3
Credentials Supervising Student Teaching	4	5.1	5	5.7	9	5.4	5	6.5
Credentials Collegiate Faculty	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6	0	0.0
Credentials Others	2	2.6	1	1.1	3	1.8	3	3.9
Candidates' Written Statements	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6	0	0.0
Column Total	78	47.0	88	53.0	166	100.0	77	47.0

SION: FACTORS OF PROFESSIONAL NATURE

	Rank Two						Rank Three									
tal	Principals		Teachers		Sum Total		Principals		Teachers		Sum Total		Principals		Teachers	
%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
2.4	0	0.0	1	.6	1	.6	0	0.0	2	2.3	2	1.2	3		4	
							1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6	1			
2.4	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6							4		1	
.6							1	1.3	1	1.1	2	1.2			1	
.6													1			
							0	0.0	1	1.1	2	1.2			1	
6.5	5	6.5	5	5.7	10	6.1	4	5.3	1	1.1	5	3.1	29	1	30	1
1.4	4	5.2	10	11.5	14	8.5	4	5.3	3	3.4	7	4.3	17	3	23	2
1.8	0	0.0	2	2.3	2	1.2	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6	1		5	
	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6							1			
	1	1.3	2	2.3	3	1.8	1	1.3	3	3.4	4	2.5	2		5	
1.2	1	1.3	1	1.1	2	1.2	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6	1		4	
.6															1	
7.2	4	5.2	5	5.7	9	5.5	1	1.3	7	8.0	8	4.9	15	4	15	4.5
1.8	7	9.1	3	3.4	10	6.1	4	5.3	8	9.2	12	7.4	13	5.5	12	6
3.0	11	14.3	10	11.5	21	12.8	12	15.8	3	3.4	15	9.2	26	2	15	4.5
5.4	5	6.5	8	9.2	13	7.9	4	5.3	8	9.2	12	7.4	13	5.5	21	3
.6	0	0.0	5	5.7	5	3.0	0	0.0	4	4.6	4	2.5	1		9	7
1.8	3	3.9	0	0.0	3	1.8	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6				
.6	0	0.0	1	.6	1	.6	1	1.3	2	2.3	3	1.8	2		3	
0.0	77	47.0	87	53.0	164	100.0	76	46.6	87	53.4	163	100.0				

Factors of Personal Nature. In Table 25, it may be noted that two factors were clearly important:

Principals	f
Ability to Work with Others	37
Personality	28
Teachers	
Personality	39
Ability to Work with Others	21

TABLE 25. THE FINAL DECISIO

Factors of Personal Nature	Rank One							
	Principals		Teachers		Raw Total		Principa	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Personality	11	14.1	12	13.6	23	13.9	12	15.
Ability to work with others	5	6.4	6	6.8	11	6.6	12	15.
Diversity of personal interest and hobbies	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6		
Physical Appearance								
Personal Grooming (clothes)	1	1.3	1	1.1	2	1.2	3	3.
Extra-Curricular Activities (H.S. and leadership roles)							1	1.
Extra-Curricular Activities (H.S./ college leadership roles)								
Work experience	1	1.3	1	1.1	3	1.2	0	0.
Travel experience							2	2.
Maturity	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.2	2	2.
Marriage status							0	0.
Military experiences							1	1.
	78	47.0	88	53.0	166	100.0	77	47.

FINAL DECISION: FACTORS OF PERSONAL NATURE

	Rank Two						Rank Three									
tal	Principals		Teachers		Raw Total		Principals		Teachers		Raw Total		Principals		Teachers	
%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
3.9	12	15.6	13	14.9	25	15.2	5	6.6	14	16.7	9	11.7	28	2	39	1
6.6	12	15.6	6	6.9	18	11.0	20	26.3	9	10.3	29	17.8	37	1	21	2
.6																
1.2	3	3.9	0	0	3	1.8	4	5.3	0	0.0	4	2.5	8		1	
	1	1.3	0	0	1	.6							1		1	
1.2	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6	1		3	
	2	2.6	3	3.4	5	3.0							2		3	
1.2	2	2.6	3	3.4	5	3.0	5	6.6	3	3.4	8	4.9	8		7	
	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6									1	
	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	.6							1			
0.0	77	47.0	88	53.0	166	100.0	78	47.0	88	53.0	166	100.0				

Other Factors. No factor in this category stands out as significant.

TABLE 26. THE FINAL DECISION: OTHER FACTORS

Other Factors	Rank One						Rank Two			
	Principals		Teachers		Raw Total		Principals		Teachers	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
No degree beyond B.S.	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6				
No experience	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6	0	0.0	2	2.3
Satisfactory (or better) score on some test - school district										
Local resident	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6	0	0.0	2	2.3
Evidence of permanence	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6				
Enthusiasm for our community	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6	1	1.3	1	1.1
Enthusiasm for school system	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6	2	2.6	3	3.4
Prior knowledge of candidate	0	0.0	4	4.5	4	2.4	0	0.0	2	2.3
	78	47.0	88	53.0	166	100.0	77	47.0	87	53.0

Part V Suggestions for Qualitative Improvement of Program. This portion of the questionnaire was open-ended in order to provide respondents with the greatest degree of latitude possible. Because the number of responses to each of the three questions posed was so limited, no attempt was made to separate the responses (Principals/Teachers) and compare results. Instead, all responses have been placed in categories and the appropriate observations noted.

Question #1

What areas would you like to see in our program of Teacher Education for future elementary majors?*

*Areas -- Topics, Competenceis, Skills, Knowlege, Experience. etc.

icant.

N: OTHER FACTORS

Rank Two					Rank Three									
ncipals	Teachers		Raw Total		Principals		Teachers		Raw Total		Principals		Teachers	
%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
					0	0.0	1	1.1	1	.6			2	
0.0	2	2.3	2	1.2									3	
0.0	2	2.3	2	1.2	0	0.0	3	3.4	3	1.8			6	3
					1	1.3	1	1.1	2	1.2	1		2	
1.3	1	1.1	2	1.2	0	0.0	1	1.1	1		1		3	
2.6	3	3.4	5	3.0	4	5.3	4	4.6	8	4.9	6	1	8	2
0.0	2	2.3	2	1.2	1	1.3	4	4.6	5	3.1	1		10	1
47.0	87	53.0	64	100.0	76	46.6	87	53.4	163	100.0				

is por-

s with

ses to

o sepa-

, all

ns noted.

Thirty-one responses to this question were received. Several respondents offered two or more suggestions. Many principals remarked that this was a difficult question because of their unfamiliarity with The Block Program. Many of the responses noted in this area were really more appropriate for the second question (areas to be strengthened). Nevertheless, all responses are noted in Table 27 as received.

TABLE 27. TEACHER EDUCATION: NEW AREAS NEEDED

	f
Admission to Teaching Profession	
Better Screening	3
Courses	
Reading (More)	3
Topics	
Outdoor Education	1
Career Education	2
Introduction to School Administration	1
Teacher Impact upon Pupil Attitude/Feeling	1
Field Experiences	
Need for Diversity (Type of Community)	6
Specific Competencies	
Classroom Management/Discipline	7
Planning	3
Provide for Individual Differences (Learning Disabilities)	3
Introduction to Various Teaching Styles and Modes	2
Public Relations	1
Decision Making	1
Organization	1
A-V (Equip. Opr.)	1
Preparation of Learning Centers	1
Evaluation	1
Personal Qualities	
Empathy	2
Openness	1
Professional Demeanor	1
Other	
Student Should be Required to do Manual Labor	1
College Professors Should Emulate Teaching Model	1

Question #2

What areas in our present program of Teacher Education need to be strengthened?

Twenty-five responses to this question were received. Several respondents offered two or more observations. Table 28 summarizes this data.

TABLE 28. TEACHER EDUCATION: AREAS TO BE STRENGTHENED

	f
Courses	
Reading	4
Math (Metrics)	1
Methods (Need to be more practical)	1
Field Experiences	
More opportunity to work with children, to experiment to evaluate instructional processes, for diversified experience	8
Specific Competencies	
Classroom Management/Discipline	6
Parent Teacher/Public Relations	2
Providing for Individual Differences	2
Organizational Ability	1
Evaluation and Grading Practices	1
Planning	1
Operating A-V Equipment	1
Personal Qualities (of Teacher Education Candidates)	
Grooming and Dress	1
Enthusiasm	1
Character	1
Creativity	1
Self-Discipline	1

Question #3

What areas do you see as "questionable"? (Areas which might be considered for elimination from our program of Teacher Education.)

Seven responses were received. No pattern was noticeable. One response related to the M.S. Degree and did not relate at all to our undergraduate program of Teacher Education.

TABLE 29. TEACHER EDUCATION: QUESTIONABLE AREAS OF PROGRAM

Area	f
General Requirements (course)	1
Music Courses (general and professional)	1
Methods Courses (as presently structured)	1
Philosophy of Education	1
Emphasis on Theory	1
Emphasis on Model or Ideal Programs	1
M.S. Degree (as presently structured)	1

PART FOUR

THE CONCLUSIONS

The single most important person in the selective process is the building principal. In most instances, this person will hold at least one degree from IUB. The likelihood of the principal holding an IUB degree increases if he possesses either an Ed.S. or an Ed.D.

The reputation of an institution is a factor in the employment process but not nearly as significant as one might have anticipated. This study clearly reveals that respondents (principals) have little knowledge regarding those things which contribute to the development of an outstanding reputation (national status, AACTE Awards, research studies). Reputation becomes increasingly more important as principals gain additional education.

At the Initial Stage in the employment process, institutional reputation seems to be most important. The study revealed nothing of significance regarding Professional, Personal, or Other (factors) although Teachers felt that being a Local Resident would give them an advantage in getting a position. This view was not, however, supported by Principals.

At the Second Stage, many factors emerge. Insofar as Principals are concerned, Competency (Professional), as revealed by Student Teaching and other field experiences, is by far the most important factor to be considered. While recognizing this, Teachers also thought that Reputation was also very significant at this juncture, a point of view not shared by Principals.

Personal Factors did not appear to be so important at this middle stage although both Principals and Teachers thought that one's Extra Curricular

Activities (High School and College) might be of some interest. Several Other Factors are important to note, particularly that those related to Enthusiasm--enthusiasm for the schools and for the community. Teachers rated the following much higher than Principals: Degree Status (no Masters); Lack of Experience; Local Resident; Evidence of Permanence; and Prior Knowledge of Candidate.

At the Third Stage, a definite pattern does emerge with respect to Professional and Personal Factors. This pattern is recognized by both Principals and Teachers. Competency, Philosophy, and Classroom Management are professional factors of the utmost importance. Personality, Ability to Work With Others, Work Experiences, and Leadership (Extra Curricular Activities) are the other factors recognized by both groups. Institutional reputation and credentials are no longer of great significance although Teachers still think they are.

In general, Teachers rate factors as being more significant than do Principals. Their ratings are consistently higher. They also tend to mention more items than Principals.

With respect to program improvement, the findings were inconclusive. If anything, varied field experience and emphasis on classroom management should be considerations for future development.

APPENDICES

The Block Program

Related Studies

1973-75 Graduates of The Block Program: A Follow-Up Study, Edward G. Buffie, Principal Investigator, 31 pp., February, 1976.

Perceptions and Feelings of Elementary Majors in The Block Program, Edward G. Buffie, Principal Investigator, 40 pp., June, 1976.

1976 Graduates of The Block Program: A Follow-Up Study, Edward G. Buffie, Principal Investigator, 35 pp., February, 1977.

1976 Graduates of The Block Program: Selection Factors and Teaching Success, Edward G. Buffie, Principal Investigator, 33 pp., November, 1977.

1977 Graduates of The Block Program: A Follow-Up Study, Edward G. Buffie, Principal Investigator, 35 pp., April, 1978.

APPENDIX II

Department of Elementary Education
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

THE SEARCH FOR A TEACHING POSITION

A Job Search Model
Designed and Developed
by
Edward G. Buffie

Introduction

Your goal is to find a full-time teaching position. Today this is more difficult to achieve than in years past. With intelligent planning, you can and will be successful in this endeavor. Keep in mind that persistence is an important factor in finding a job. Also note that decisions are being made late in the summer. Most employment and offering of contracts is likely to take place in August or very late July. April-May are very slow months--little forward action takes place. This knowledge should definitely affect your planning.

This model is constantly being revised as new data and information come to light. Changes this year have come about as the result of two major investigations conducted by the developer.*

This Job Search Model is based upon the assumption that the jobs are there--let's go get them. Since some eighty to ninety per cent of our graduates find teaching positions every year, there must be considerable validity to both the assumption and the model.

Phase I Background

Transcripts

Many school districts will require a copy of your official transcripts. Know where to obtain these and the conditions for same. To wit:

A. These will be released only at the request of the candidate (you).

B. First copy is free, all others $2.00 each.

C. Send your check and appropriate directions to:

Office of the Registrar, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47401

---

* 1977 Graduates of The Block Program: A Follow-Up Study, Edward G. Buffie, Principal Investigator, 35 pp., April, 1978.
Significant Factors In The Employment Process: Views From Administrators and Teachers, Edward G. Buffie, Principal Investigator, 45 pp., Fall, 1978.

Credentials

Although a few districts would consider your candidacy without reviewing your credentials, most will not. Fill these out carefully and completely, particularly your Candidate's Page. Your credentials, including references, should be completed before making initial contact with a school district. Incidentally, you must pick up your own reference forms (The Right To Privacy Act requires this procedure). Reference forms will not be sent to writers even though they may request them. You must have a minimum of two references before your credentials will be released. They will be sent either at your request or at the request of a prospective employer.

The Placement Bureau

Establish a relationship with the Placement Bureau. Stop by in person or else write. Mrs. Louise Routt is fully aware of our efforts to assist you and has been most cooperative. Meet her if possible.

The Right To Privacy Act

When you ask people to write a statement in your behalf, should you sign a waiver? If you do so, you will not have the right to actually see what is written about you. How do prospective employers react to statements when candidates have not waived such rights? Research on this point has resulted in mixed responses. For half our respondents, creditability is clearly at stake. If the candidate does not sign the waiver, they simply do not value the reference in any way. Without confidentiality, these people simply do not believe that an honest appraisal will be forthcoming. The other half of our research respondents don't care whether the reference is signed or not. Since you, the candidate, select the writer in the first place, they assume that all references will be good anyway. For these people, reference statements do not carry much weight in decision-making.

The Placement Bureau, on the other hand, reports that most administrators prefer that the waiver be signed. Personal experience supports this view. It is suggested that you sign the waiver except in cases where you really do not have any idea what people are going to write. Recommendations are usually important in the selection process, particularly those written by classroom and collegiate supervisors (those who are very familiar with your teaching). Statements written by college faculty members are next in terms of importance. To conclude that recommendations and references are not important would be risky.

Phase II Identifying Job Location Possibilities

Geographical Parameters

You need now to establish geographical parameters with respect to potential teaching positions. This is a critical point in the entire process. Be honest with yourself!

Would you be willing to teach anywhere in the world? (The deserts of Africa or jungles of South America.) Are you interested in the U.S. or Canada? Are you interested in a particular region of the country?

You need also to consider questions such as: Am I interested in teaching in a large city? A suburb? Small-medium sized town or city? Rural area?

For some people, the geographical parameters are very tight. For example, a person may want to, or have to, live in the Bloomington area.

Pinpointing School Districts

If you can, try and pinpoint specific communities where you would like to teach. For those hoping to teach in the Bloomington area, you may wish to take a map and draw a circle around Bloomington. The radius of the circle might represent 40 to 50 miles, a distance you would be willing to drive should a job be offered you. If possible, you might want to drive around the different areas, talk with people, or read about the communities in question. On the basis of such information, you may wish to rule out certain areas for one reason or another or else establish some sort of priority.

Once the communities are identified, it is then possible to obtain a list of the school districts, as well as the names of all superintendents and principals, serving these areas. When this has been achieved, you are ready to begin written communication.

Some of you will not have tight geographical parameters associated with your job search as illustrated in the above paragraph. You may operate in a different way. Teaching positions are frequently advertised. You may wish to obtain such listings and then plan where you will apply. Or you, too, may wish to identify selected communities and then proceed as above with your own direct contacts. This is strongly recommended. Many jobs are not listed or advertised. The time period for hiring is frequently too short or else districts do not want hundreds of applicants.

Friends Can Help

Research has clearly shown that Persistence and Help of a Friend are two critical factors in locating a teaching position. Once you have established your geographical parameters, do not hesitate to seek help from your friends in order to: (1) find out if job openings have occurred; or (2) get names of people to contact. Do let people know of your availability even if there are no positions open at the moment. Who to contact is frequently a problem and does vary depending upon the size and organization of a district. Your friends can really help at this juncture.

Former Block students are your friends. You have a common bond and students do help each other. Refer to The Block File if you want to see if former students are teaching in an area of your interest (see also Phase III).

Phase III Check Job Listings

If you have tight geographical parameters associated with your search, you may skip this phase and move directly into Phase IV. This occurs because you have a limited number of options; therefore, you'll probably make inquiries to all districts.

Available Positions

If you are registered with the School of Education Placement Bureau, you will receive job listings from that office on a regular time interval, usually a week to ten days. You must provide this office with stamped self-addressed envelopes. Sometimes teaching positions are advertised in newspapers and professional journals. If you are interested in teaching in Iowa, teaching positions are always advertised in the Sunday Edition of the Des Moines Register (all openings in the state). ASCUS announces job openings in its monthly journal.*

Other private agencies provide information as well. Some are professional placement agencies but make certain that you check their fees--costs for their service does vary! In other instances, you may buy publications that list job openings.

As collegiate faculty, we frequently hear of openings (usually at the last moment). If you have communicated with us, we will follow up with a telephone call quickly.

Publications/Other Sources

The Placement Bureau, libraries, state and county departments of education, administrative offices for school districts, etc.--most of these will have directories of some type or another which list the names and addresses of school districts, schools, superintendents, and principals.

The most complete directory is:

Elliott, Norman F. (Editor and Publisher), Patterson's American Education, Vol. LXXI, 1978, Educational Directories, Inc., Mount Prospect, Illinois, 768 pages.

Another example of a more localized directory is:

1978 Directory of Suburban Schools
(Chicago Suburban Schools)
Educational Service Region
33 West Grand Avenue (4th floor)
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Always write to a person. "To Whom It May Concern" letters are deadly!

If you are interested in a specific location, you may wish to check The Block File. We have a rather complete record of former Block students who are presently teaching. The names and addresses of former students, schools, and principals are available in Dr. Buffie's office. This information has been used to real advantage.

---

*Copies available in the Placement Bureau.

Phase IV Written Communication*

Letters

The task here, once you receive anything at all encouraging following your initial query, is to maintain a continual flow of information to prospective employers such that you maintain visibility. You don't want to "bug people" (that's why frequent letters are better than telephone calls) but you do want them to know you are interested in them and still available. Most of your letters should not require a response.

It is suggested that you make up a model letter for each of those suggested below. Then you'll be all set when the time comes to use them. Always type up originals, of course, in any correspondence with school officials.

What are the reasons you might write to school officials?

A. Your initial letter could be

1. an inquiry--are positions available or likely to be available, I'm interested and would like to be considered a candidate, please send application form. If possible, deliver your application in person or else include a picture of yourself with your application. Visual impressions help.

2. a follow-up of positions listed--you've found out that a district has openings (Placement Bureau just notified you) you want to be considered a candidate, please send appropriate information.

B. Other letters could

1. be a follow-up--am returning application form and will look forward to hearing from you as things develop.

2. be status letters

(a) I've just finished my student teaching and recommendations or references are now available from . . . .

(b) I've just completed my undergraduate degree (finished last course in First Regular Session) and now qualify for provisional certification.

(c) I've just moved--new addresses, telephone numbers, times I can be reached.

Most Important — Be sure to keep prospective employers informed as to when, and how, you can be reached. Encourage them to call Collect. Make it as easy as possible for them to locate you quickly. Leave telephone numbers of friends and relatives as well as

---

* You should always be very prompt in any of your responses to a given school district. On the other hand, three weeks may pass by before they respond to your inquiry. School District personnel have a difficult time keeping up with correspondence in these matters.

your own. In August, things will move quickly. Prospective employers will likely call only once--help them to call at the right time. If they can't reach you, at least identify a place where they can leave a message for you.

(d) I'll be in (school area) and would be available for an interview if you so desire.

3. provide additional information

(a) I'm including a resume which may be helpful to you in considering my qualifications.

Emphasize experience, particularly that which involves children. Job and travel experience is important, too. Outside interests, sports, hobbies, etc. are also significant. If you include a picture of yourself, make sure you're smiling. Smiling, happy people are wanted!

(b) Enclosed are pictures taken during Student Teaching, units I developed, etc.

4. be requests for further information

(a) about the community, about the school district

Plan a steady flow of written communication. Receiving something every two-three weeks suggests to prospective employers that you are very interested in them. Lay out a time line, perhaps something like the following:

May	June 1	June 15	July 1	July 15	August 1
Initial letters sent out/ applications sent in	Send a resume	Student Teaching completed/ references available	Pictures of work with children (Student Teaching). Time and telephone # when I can be reached	Request info about community and schools	Be in your area/ available for interviews

Written Communication in General

What you say and how you say it is critical--many candidates are ruled out at this juncture. Poor language usage, spelling errors, and/or sloppy work can very quickly eliminate one from consideration.

Any written work should be handled with great care.

Avoid references to grade levels. Talk about teaching children, not first graders, for example.

Keep a record of all communications by district or school systems. Many people keep index cards for each district where they have applied. Note each contact you have made--date/time/persons/nature of communication.

Phase V The Interview

Lucky you! When you get to this stage, you've eliminated 99% of your competition for teaching positions! Most school systems interested in your candidacy will want you to visit with them (at your expense).

Before Hand

A. Research the situation (if you haven't already done so). Get info about the community and the schools. Read local newspapers. Arrive early and tour the community.

B. Select materials (to bring with you). Pictures/units/plans you've written/materials you developed.

C. Prepare questions that you may wish to ask. You'll always get this opportunity.

The Interview Itself

Be yourself/smile/maintain good eye contact/Look people right in the eye/ Respond to questions succinctly but do respond fully/Refer to your materials but only briefly as appropriate (don't use as crutch). Be aware of distracting language or mannerisms--avoid "you know", "O.K.", "Oh, wow", fidgeting with glasses. Chewing gum can be deadly. See also Tips on Interview.

Afterwards

Follow up immediately with some sort of Thank You Note. Note your personal observations on an index card. May be very helpful later on if you have a choice (as many indeed do) of positions.

When you have accepted a position, notify other school districts (where you have applied) of this fact. This thoughtful gesture on your part may have a great pay-off for you in the years ahead. You can never tell!

If you get an offer before another district, which you may prefer, has contacted you, it is perfectly ethical to contact the latter district to inquire about the status of your application. You can inform them of your offer. You will not have much time. When you are offered a position, a school district will want to know almost immediately of your intentions.

TIPS ON INTERVIEW

By the time you get to this stage, your pedagogical competency will probably be fairly well established insofar as the interviewers are concerned. Some verification of one's competency will, of course, occur as a result of discussion, but this is not usually the primary focus of the interview. Insights into one's personality and philosophy appear to be most important. Young people who are confident and enthusiastic usually create very positive images. People who smile and have a good sense of humor usually make good colleagues, all other things being equal. One's philosophy with respect to learning, teaching, and discipline usually emerge in response to questions relating to goals, ideal learning environments, role of the teacher, and discipline techniques.

Some specific considerations:

1. Psyche yourself toward being alert, interested, and calmly confident.
2. Don't smoke unless invited.
3. Greet interviewer by name. Follow his/her lead on handshaking. Give a firm and warm handshake.
4. Seat yourself upon invitation.
5. Maintain comfortable eye contact. Smile when appropriate.
6. Give your undivided attention and listen well.
7. Maintain an open, upright position. Avoid posture that produces constricted and inhibited movement.
8. Talk for yourself. Emerge as an individual.
9. Make sure that your points are made around the Big Two:

   "I'm interested in this position because . . . "
   "I can offer . . . "

10. Don't bluff. Be honest. Be fair to yourself.
11. Take your time. Pausing after a question indicates your intent to reply thoughtfully.
12. Stay away from put-downs. (Of yourself, school, former employers, teachers, etc.)
13. Have some specific questions. Get them answered.
14. Be alert to cues that the interview is over. Sum up your interest in two to three sentences. Say something like, "I hope you'll get in touch with me if you have anything you want me to do or if you have any further questions."
15. Don't dally around. Say "Thank you." And leave.

APPENDIX III

Study #1 Phase Two
The Block Program
School of Education
Indiana University Bloomington (IUB)

March, 1976

(Name of Respondent)

Address

Participants in the Block Program
1973-75 Graduates
(A Follow-Up Study)

Introduction. In the first phase of our study, we found that about 85 percent of our students (who were looking) were successful in finding full-time teaching positions. In this phase of our study, we are interested in two kinds of questions:

1. Why are our graduates being hired--what seem to be the significant factors in selecting candidates who participated in The Block Program at Indiana University Bloomington? In the selection process, when do the factors appear to be especially important?

2. How can we improve our program? One can never stand on past laurels! Your help in offering observations and suggestions will be most appreciated.

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this study.

Cordially,

Ash

Ashley Bishop, Director,
Block Program

Ed

Edward G. Buffie,
Professor of Education

Part I Background

A. Personal

1. Are any of your degrees from IUB (Indiana University Bloomington)? (Check as appropriate)

Bachelors	Masters	Specialist	Doctorate
yes ___	yes ___	yes ___	yes ___
no ___	no ___	no ___	no ___

2. Where did you receive your degrees? (Please fill in as appropriate if you had any No responses in A)

I received my Bachelors from _____

my Masters from _____

my Specialists from _____

my Doctorate from _____

B. School System

1. In our school system we have about _____ pupils: (Check one below)

_____ Less than 2500 _____ 2500-5000 _____ 5000-10,000 ____ over 10,000

2. Our school system is probably best described as: (Check one)

___ Rural ___ Small Town ___ Small City ___ Large City

___ Inner City

___ Rural ___ Suburban ___ Town ___ Small City ___ Large City
(if inner city, also check here ___)

C. Procedures For Hiring New Teachers

There are, of course, many different people who could be involved in the selection of teachers. The situation undoubtedly varies from one context to the next.

For each item below, indicate whether a person or group is involved (yes or no) as well as the extent of that involvement.

		Involved yes	Involved no	Extent of Involvement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Little Great
1.	School Board	___	___	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2.	Superintendent	___	___	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3	Central Office Personnel Assistant Superintendent or Director of Personnel	___	___	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4.	Principals	___	___	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5.	Teachers	___	___	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6.	Students	___	___	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7.	Parents	___	___	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

D. The decision-making process may also vary. Here we are concerned not with the process but rather with the key decision-maker(s). While many people may participate and have input into the selection process, not all are influential to the same degree when it comes to actually deciding the person who will finally be selected. (We recognize, of course, that the school board has the final legal authority to employ teachers.)

Please check the item below which most nearly describes your situation.

_____ 1. Superintendent decides

_____ 2. Director of Personnel or Assistant Superintendent decides

_____ 3. Principal decides

_____ 4. Teachers decide

_____ 5. Central Office Personnel decide (Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Supervisors, Consultants--some combination of two or more people)

_____ 6. Central Office Personnel (one or more) and Principal decide

_____ 7. Principal and Teachers decide

_____ 8. Central Office Personnel (one or more), Principal, and teachers decide

_____ 9. Other (Please explain)

Part II General Perception of School of Education
Indiana University Bloomington

It can be hypothesized that the reputation of a given school is a significant factor in the selection process before consideration is ever given to an individual applicant. This perception could be general in nature or it could relate to specific knowledge that one has about an institution.

A. To what extent is the reputation of an institution an important factor in establishing a positive mind set toward graduates of that school? (check one)

___ Not a Factor ___ Somewhat of a Consideration ___ Extremely Important

B. What is your general perception of the reputation of the Department of Elementary Education, School of Education, Indiana University Bloomington? (check one)

___ No Position or Awareness of Reputation

___ Poor Reputation

___ Satisfactory Reputation

___ Very Good Reputation

___ Excellent Reputation

C. Did the following information affect your perceptions?

1. The School of Education (IUB) is ranked in the Top Ten in the country. ___Yes ___No ___Was not aware of this

2. Twice within the past seven years the School of Education (IUB) has received national awards for the development of new programs in Teacher Education (awards received from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education) ___Yes ___No ___Was not aware of this

3. Studies conducted by the IUB Placement Bureau for the last several years reveal that the best prepared teachers in the School of Education are majors in Elementary Education and Special Education. Evaluations of beginning teachers (I.U. grads) were made by you--principals and supervisors in the public schools. ___Yes ___No ___Was not aware of this

Part III Significant Factors in The Selection Process

Here we are concerned with two kinds of things: (1) how significant are various factors which may contribute to the selection of a given candidate; and (2) at what point(s) is a given factor important in the selection process.

We have identified three stages in the selection process which we hope you will use in providing a second response for each item below. The first stage is the Initial Contact Stage--probably a letter or telephone call inquiring about openings and/or requesting an application form. In the second stage you now have access to information not previously available and now you must decide whether or not to invite someone in for an interview--this information may have been provided in the form of a letter, an application form, a vita or resume, a person's credentials, or quite possibly in a short conversation. At the last stage (the third), you have had in-depth interviews with candidates and now must decide whm whom to employ.

For each item below, indicate the extent to which a given factor is important. Then, for that same item, please indicate when that particular factor is important--it may be important at one or more stages.

Example

To what extent, and when, are each of the following factors significant in the selection process: (circle one numeral)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Important at the (Check all ___'s as appropriate)		
	Not too Important / Has some Significance / Very Important	Initial Contact	Second Stage	Interview Stage
Personality	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	X	X
A. Factors of a Professional Nature				
1. Reputation of Indiana University (Bloomington)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___

			Initial Contact	Second. Stage	Interview Stage
2.	Reputation of the School of Education (Bloomington)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
3.	Reputation of the Department of Elementary Education (Bloomington)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
4.	My personal acquaintance with a faculty member(s)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
5.	Reputation of a given program, i.e., The Bl The Block Program, within a department (Bloomington)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
6.	Reputation of the Placement Bureau (IUB)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
7.	General teaching competency (well informed and has ability to perform accordingly)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
8.	Student Teaching Performance	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
9.	Experience in a <u>special</u> student teaching project, i.e., Urban Semester, Latino Project, Rural Education Project, American Indian Project, etc.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
10.	Pre student teaching experiences (aid, observer, participant, volunteer, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___

			Initial Contact	Second Stage	Interview Stage
11.	Related experience with children (Boys Club, teaching, swimming, Scouts, Sunday School Teaching etc.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
12.	Grades in professional courses	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
13.	Grades in other university work	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
14.	Philosophy of Education	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
15.	Philosophy as related to classroom management (discipline)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
16.	Ability to carry out or implement one's classroom manage philosophy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
17.	Credentials: Statements by those supervising student teaching	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
18.	Credentials: Statements by collegiate faculty	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
19.	Credentials: Statements by others	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
20.	Candidate's own written statements (in letters, on application forms, vita, in credentials)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
21.	Other (Please explain)				

			Initial Contact	Second Stage	Interview Stage
B.	Factors of a Personal Nature				
1.	Personality Please list several words or phrases to give us an idea of what you look for--	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
2.	Ability to work with others (children, colleagues, parents)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
3.	Diversity of personal interests and hobbies	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
4.	Physical Appearance	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
5.	Personal appearance (clothes) and grooming	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
6.	Extra-Curricular Activities (High school/college-- participant)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
7.	Extra-Curricular Activities (High school/college-- leadership roles)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
8.	Work experience	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___

			Initial Contact	Second Stage	Interview Stage
9.	Travel experience	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
10.	Maturity	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
11.	Marriage Status	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
12.	Military experiences	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
C.	Other Factors				
1.	No degree beyond the Baccalaureate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
2.	No experience (for contractual purposes/ beyond Student Teaching	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
3.	Satisfactory (or better) score on some test administered by the school district	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
4.	A local person (applicant was a local resident)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
5.	Evidence of permanence	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
6.	Enthusiasm for our community	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
7.	Enthusiasm for our school (or school system)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___
8.	Prior knowledge of candidate (A friend of the candidate contacted you--a telephone call, a letter)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	___	___	___

9. The Right to Privacy Act gives candidates access to their files--they can read the reference statements that appear in credentials unless they waive that right in writing. If they waive this right, a statement and signature so noting appears on the actual reference form.

If a student does not sign this waiver, will this have a negative or neutral effect upon you the reader? (check one)

___ Yes, would definitely affect my interpretation of what is written. Statement would probably have questionable value.

___ Makes no difference to me. I will interpret the reference the same way regardless of whether or not the candidate's rights are waived.

___ Hadn't really thought about it particularly. May or may not make a difference insofar as I am concerned.

Part IV The Final Decision

Please scan over the factors in Part III and identify what appear to be the three most significant factors in arriving at your final decision.

List by letter and number. For example: A-1 (Reputation of University)

The three most important factors are:

A. _____

B. _____

C. _____

Part V Suggestions For Qualitative Improvement of Program

Of necessity this portion of the questionnaire needs to be open-ended. As you reflect upon teaching performance, what suggestions do you have for us?

A. What areas* would you like to see in the program of teacher preparation for future elementary majors? (Not presently in program)

B. What areas in the present program of teacher education would you like to see strengthened? (In present program but requiring more emphasis)

*Area--Topics, Competencies (to be developed), skills, knowledge, experience, etc.

C. What areas would you see as "questionable"? (Areas which might be considered for elimination from the program of teacher preparation)

Many, many thanks for your cooperation!

We will be most happy to also send you a summary of this phase of the study if you will check the box on the cover page. Thanks again!

Ash and Ed